SOCY710 UKZN Howard College Campus. Are Humans Part of Nature?

By Sicelo 'Vezi' Mlambo. Sicelo12345@gmail,com

Are Humans Part of Nature?

Not a single reasonable thinker will ever be tempted to hypothesize or even insinuate that there has ever been a time in history when people were independent of nature for survival. Such conjectures, if they are already in existence, should be utterly rejected even when Jiabiangou labor camp that was located in Gansu province of China that operated from 1957 to 1961 where people, human beings, Homo sapiens started having one another for breakfast, dinner and supper (Johnson; 2014). This short essay will prove that humans are part of nature.

The word 'nature' is one of the interesting concepts in different disciplines that concerns themselves with understanding environment. The equilibrium definition is that "nature is what is not artificial" (Maldonado: 2015 pg. 17). But after the legacy of Gregor Mendel (1822 – 1844) it could takes too much ignorance to defend this definition at all cost. Of course people like Mill (1998) complicated this term even more further as to, nature is all the powers existing in either the outer or the inner world and everything which takes place by means of those powers". Barnard (2006) argues that the word 'nature' can be used to mean all that is in the physical world as opposed to anything supernatural or nonphysical. Maldonado (2015) notes that the term nature ('φύσις') firstly appeared around 7000 BCE amongst Greeks was used to refer to plants.

Are people part of nature? Using the grammatical prerogative entrenched on the fact that the topic is in a question form, one chooses the negative response, because people are really part of nature. Here is the applicability of evolutional, anthropological, philosophical and scientific understanding of nature.

The following allegations are true: firstly that ever since people came into existence, which this was; according to Howell (2015), about two hundred thousand years ago, their survival has always been sustained by the existence of nature. It is true that human existence is still derived from nature, and that will be the status quo for all human histories. It is true that people are solely responsible for greenhouse gasses that molest the ozone layer and that environmentalists are on mission to mobilize people into a 'save human beings' campaign, technically because human beings are swiftly approaching their potential extinct point. Indeed people are responsible for global warming, deforestation, overfishing and species extinct and changing ocean chemistry (Smith: 2011).

SOCY710 UKZN Howard College Campus. Are Humans Part of Nature?

By Sicelo 'Vezi' Mlambo. Sicelo12345@gmail,com

Nonetheless it is also true that, like any other existing element, be it a plant or an animal, human beings were thrown into existence by processes, joining the then already existing flora and fauna. People are nature themselves.

Homo sapiens are not the first species ever to transform planet Earth into a populated planet. That credit belongs to cyanobacteria, blue green algae that evolved about 3.5 billion years ago and promptly began to fill the methane-based atmosphere with oxygen (Harari: 2014). Hence trying to reason that people are not part of nature because they 'harm' it is stupid and a waste of time if there is no scientific evidence to prove cyanobacteria and algae are not. People destroying nature is a technical suicidal act, like capitalism hoping for better future while paving its way to grave (Dillion: 2014), simply because they are part of nature.

By virtue of people being responsible for the damage to environment does not qualify the contrary. This can be proven by the conjecture that people are not non-animals beings. If one believes human being are not animals, then Charles Darwin (1809-1882) and his book 'On The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection' written in 1859 and La Barre (1954) on 'The human animal' become the recommendable center of remedy for their discombobulation. People are just strange kind of animals (Morris: 2005).

In that regard, Barnard (2006) teaches that humans are a part of nature because they are biological beings under who live under the influence of physical laws. People are nature. They are members of this family called nature. Their inexistence outside the family resolutely proves that indeed they are part of it. Human functioning depends on other components of nature (James; 2004).

As argued above that human beings evolved like any other natural element, there is no doubt that human beings threaten the existence of some species. This relationship that people have with other components of nature can be explained by a phrase 'survival of the fittest'. Survival of the fittest is a phrase in Darwinian evolutionary theory that explains the mechanism in natural selection that explains the preservation of favored races in the struggle for life (Spenser; 1884). One can use that to explain that human beings are sustaining their survival by using available resources, these resourcing being plants and animals. In this sense, humans are a part of the broader system of existence with other components of nature bottled in one cage, feasting from one another.

SOCY710 UKZN Howard College Campus. Are Humans Part of Nature?

By Sicelo 'Vezi' Mlambo. Sicelo12345@gmail,com

Many people who believe humans are not part of nature use the argument that human beings exploit nature by seeing it as instruments. These ideas conclude that human beings fail to understand that trees and animals, soil, wetlands and other parts of ecosystem have intrinsic value. Intrinsic value is the term used mostly in ecocentrism and environmental philosophy. Ecocentrism is that holistic environmental theory, according to which not only living beings, but the whole ecosystem, including the abiotic part of nature, is worthy of moral consideration because they have intrinsic value (Zimmerman; 2005). Intrinsic value is a concept used to describe the value each object, in this case, nature; has on its own without being seen as an instrument for anything. In contrast, intrinsic value explains what instrumental value is not (Piccolo; 2015). Kant (1991) argue that only humans have this self-consciousness called intrinsic, but there is significant evidence for the contrary (Vucetich *et al;* 2015).

In contrast, environmental philosophers are correct on pointing out that abiotic parts of ecosystem have intrinsic value. The dichotomy here is, should nature be protected because of its instrumental value or intrinsic value? Although Piccolo (2015) argues that this is an "Unhelpful dichotomy amongst conservationist" (pg. 8), but in a question of whether or not humans are part of nature, Piccolo's (2015) view is incorrect because, out of this conservationists argument rests the direction in which people should see nature, that is, are other animals and plants and abiotic parts of ecosystem people's prey or 'family members 'or both.

White's (1996) submission is that man's relation to the soil was intensely reformed. Formerly man had been part of nature; now he was the exploiter on nature. By so saying, White (1996) contradicted himself, or remain unclear rather on the nature of relationship of human with nature because his statement insinuate that being part of nature and exploiter of nature is mutually exclusive. White (1996) also did not prove that during the time when 'man was part of nature' as he puts it, human beings did not see any instrumental value in nature. What is true is that humans were, in the past, more physically and psychologically connected to nature than people living in industrialized nations today (Melson, 2001; Shepard, 1993, 1996).

Being 'the exploiter' of nature and 'part of nature' are not mutually exclusive conditions to human beings. The reason behind this is, humans acknowledge at least instrumental value of nature or both values (intrinsic and instrumental) for that matter.

SOCY710 UKZN Howard College Campus. Are Humans Part of Nature?

By Sicelo 'Vezi' Mlambo. Sicelo12345@gmail,com

When it comes to a way we, humans relate to nature, it is a same way bourgeoisies relate to the proletariats, they are both humans, but the other derives its existence at the expense of the other, yet both are humans.

In this regard, to nature, humans are capitalists, for they sustain their health and social wellbeing at the expense of the rest of ecosystem components. A valid and scientific argument is that as industrialization intensifies, human hostility to the environment proliferates. Industrialization hostility to environment does not even form a cell of evidence to prove that humans are not part of nature.

Wilson (1984) correctly believes that humans have an innate kinship for nature which he terms 'biophilia'. Eleven years prior Wilson's (1984) submission, Naess (1973) named the sense of inclusion in nature that people have as 'ecological identity or self'.

Human are part of nature. It a philosophical dwarf reasoning to arguments that humans are not part of nature because their actions are destructive or undermines the intrinsic value of nature. It is true that people depend on nature for their survival, they eat and find comfort in nature. In this regard, even the case of Jiabiangou labor camp when people started cannibalistic behaviors, they were actually continuing on eating nature, pity these were their immediate components in broad ecosystem. Connection between humans with nature will last for the duration of human beings existence. This essay has provided intellectual evidence at a philosophical and evolutionary level of reasoning to prove that humans are part of nature.